

DATE: August 24, 2001

TO: Agency Personnel Administrators

FROM: Jeffrey C. Schutt  
Director, Human Resource Services

SUBJECT: Implementation of System Changes, JEL 02-1

The system changes, made as a result of the Teacher consolidation study, are indicated on the accompanying chart and are approved for implementation.

The effective date for each change is September 1, 2001, as indicated on the attached "Summary of System Changes" chart. The Teacher and Teacher Aide class descriptions are included with this letter. Information will be available on the web site below on September 1.

[http://www.state.co.us/gov\\_dir/gss/hr/groups/jesgi.html](http://www.state.co.us/gov_dir/gss/hr/groups/jesgi.html).

Please provide this information to appointing authorities, directly affected employees, and any others in your agency who may need this information.

If you have any questions, please contact Job Evaluation and Compensation at 303-866-2455.

Attachment

## SUMMARY OF SYSTEM CHANGES

JE Letter # 02-1

Date of Letter: September 1, 2001

### Job Evaluation and Compensation

\* P = proposed; F = final (only F is to be entered into EMPL and ADS)

P or F*	CD Changes			Current Class		New Class		Occ Group		Grade		Pay Diff.		Effective Date
	New	Rev	Abol	Code	Title (limit 25 characters)	Code	Title (limit 25 characters)	From	To	From	To	From	To	
F		X		J1A1*B	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J26	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*C	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J28	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*D	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J31	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*E	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J33	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*F	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J38	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*H	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J26	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*I	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J28	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*J	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J31	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*K	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J33	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A1*L	Teacher I	nc	nc	T	nc	J38	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A2*A	Teacher II	nc	nc	T	nc	J38	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A2*G	Teacher II	nc	nc	T	nc	J38	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A3*A	Teacher III	nc	nc	T	nc	J42	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J1A3*G	Teacher III	nc	nc	T	nc	J42	nc		nc	9/1/01
F		X		J2A1XX	Teacher Aide	nc	nc	T	nc	J10	nc		nc	9/1/01



# **SYSTEM MAINTENANCE STUDY**

## **NARRATIVE REPORT -- FINAL CHANGES**

### **TEACHERS AND CHILDHOOD EDUCATORS**

**Class Codes J1A1\*\* - J1A3\*\* and J2A1XX and C2C1TX - C2C3XX**

**Conducted Fiscal Year 2001-2002**

#### **BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF STUDY**

This system-wide study is part of the Department of Personnel/General Support Services' (hereafter the department) statutory responsibility, CRS 24-50-104(1)(b), for maintaining and revising the system of classes covering all positions in the state personnel system. Such maintenance may include the assignment of appropriate pay grades that reflect prevailing wage as mandated by CRS 24-50-104(1)(a). These class series were last studied in 1992-3 when the Job Evaluation System Redesign Project was accomplished.

The department initiated this study after several years of employee questions and issues on minimum qualifications and the basis for advancement to higher levels in the Teacher I classes. Following a meeting with personnel representatives of the two major users, Department of Corrections (DOC) and Department of Human Services (DHS), the department decided to do a complete review of all aspects of the teacher occupational group. This decision was also driven by the system-wide consolidation efforts of the department for the other occupational groups. The pending implementation of the performance pay system replacing anniversary increases was also a motivating factor to study this group. As a result of another concurrent system consolidation study, the Health Care Services (HCS) occupational group, the Early Childhood Educator series of three classes was identified as a candidate for movement into the Teacher (T) Occupational Group.

One topic that was outside the scope of this study was the change in pay grade maximums caused by the delay and program changes associated with the state's performance pay system. Those changes were covered as part of the annual salary survey process and were presented in the December 2000 Total Compensation Survey Report.

## METHODOLOGY

The Teacher study was announced on the Human Resource Services (HRS) website in late August 2000 and the September *Advisor* also contained an article announcing the study. The user agency HR Administrators had earlier been asked to identify study group representatives to the Job Evaluation/Compensation Unit. Only the primary user agencies, DHS and DOC elected to have full-time representatives on the study group. Both agencies designated one HR specialist and one or more academic and vocational subject matter experts for the study. The study chair recruited licensing and credentialing advisors from the Colorado Department of Education (state teacher licensing authority) and the Community Colleges of Colorado (CC of C) (vocational credentialing authority). Additionally, the chair asked for an advisor on minimum qualifications from the Selection System Management staff to participate in part of the study.

The study group assembled mid-September 2000 to establish the study objectives and then approximately every two weeks through mid-May 2001. As part of the study plan, the group elected to conduct two open forums in February 2001 to gather further input on issues and alternative solutions from teaching employees in the personnel system and from employee organizations.

For communication, the chair furnished working notes from all meetings to the study group members. Additionally, one purpose of the two open forums was to communicate with employees so they knew the purpose and objectives of this system maintenance study as well as to provide input to the study group.

Demographics of the occupational group: The Teacher Aide class consists of 44 positions and is used by four departments, including two higher education agencies. The Teacher class, with approximately 246 positions, is primarily used in the Department of Corrections and Department of Human Services Youth Corrections. In addition, there are two positions at the University of Colorado Health Sciences Center. DOC has over 70% of the positions in this class with expected future growth due to the expanding prison populations over the next few years. The three Early Childhood Educator classes (78 positions) are used only in higher education child care facilities.

Prior to the study, the Teacher Occupational Group consisted of four classes of work. The Teacher I class had five different pay academic achievement levels (hereinafter referred to as lanes) for both academic and vocational positions; and the Teacher II and III classes had two different pay lanes for both academic and vocational positions. Historically, these lanes have been used in the state personnel system and by all public school districts statewide for both academic and vocational teachers.

The Teacher classes' turnover rates were examined and the data showed that the FY99 statewide rate was approximately 10.3% and increased to 15.9% in FY00. This is consistent with the agency reports on increasing difficulties in recruiting replacements. This is also confirmed by the licensing and credentialing authorities reporting an increase in the number of emergency requests for a license or a vocational credential. This was judged as a general lack of fully qualified teachers in the labor market. These facts are

also consistent with the state's reported low unemployment and deficiency of qualified applicants across most occupations.

The co-chairs of the study visited a sample of six school districts along the Front Range to gather specific information on topics to validate reported salary and benefit levels and to obtain information on hiring, retention, promotion, and other contractual practices typically used by public school districts. The six districts visited were: Buena Vista, Canon City, Denver, Douglas County, Littleton, and Widefield (Colorado Springs). These represented both large and small and rural and urban areas. All except one have collective bargaining agreements. Four of the six have vocational programs. Information was also collected on any performance measures or standards used and copies of these were furnished to the two major departments participating in the study.

Following information gathering and discussions on issues and potential solutions, the study group scheduled two open forum meetings with employees, supervisors, and employee organizations. One was held in Canon City at the DOC Training Academy and the other at Fort Logan to be teleconferenced to three remote sites. Approximately 55 attended the Canon City forum and 13 attended the Fort Logan session. Unfortunately, two of the three teleconferencing sites were unable to participate due to video and audio difficulties and the third site experienced marginal audio reception.

Following the two forums, the study group reviewed the issues and ideas presented and incorporated some of those into the study process. The majority of the issues presented at the Canon City session were agency-level issues that cannot be resolved by this system maintenance study. The DOC representatives have undertaken a separate initiative to meet further with their teacher employees to address some of those issues.

Agency-specific issues were identified during the course of this study and are presented in this narrative only for the purposes of documentation because they arise from agency management's discretion to apply personnel system rules, procedures, and guidelines. Those identified were: the non-typical working environment experienced by many state personnel system teachers (e.g., locked facilities, threats of violence), non-use of the existing Teacher II class in one agency's organizational structure; the decision by one agency to maintain a teacher's salary instead of offering an immediate increase upon elevation to the next higher academic achievement level or lane (e.g., from a Bachelor's degree to a Bachelor's degree plus 20 hours); the assignment of additional duties to teachers without additional compensation; teachers being supervised by non-teacher positions; previous work experience outside of the state system not being considered when setting the initial hire salary; teaching and correctional security experience not counting towards the experience requirements of non-teacher positions in higher classes in the personnel system; and, the increasing use of contract teachers performing similar duties at different compensation levels. Because these decisions rest with agency appointing authorities, they are outside the scope of this study and no recommendations will be made related to them.

## **ISSUES AND FINDINGS**

### **Teacher Aide class**

The study group found no substantive issues or concerns with the single Teacher Aide class. In general, this class is used by some agencies for short periods of time while graduate teachers are obtaining the appropriate license or credential. The single biggest user, the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind (Department of Education), has found the class concepts, factor levels, and pay grades sufficient. Therefore, other than updates to the minimum qualifications (class profile) for current terminology and minor rewording, there are no changes being recommended to this class.

### **Teacher I class**

The study team identified five broad issues with this class: number of lanes needed and justified; basis of movement from one lane to the next; basis for determining appropriate salary grades; a potential need for an intermediate work leader class; and the equivalency of vocational experience (credentialed) to the academic license and advanced degrees.

**USE OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT LANES:** The Teacher classes in the state personnel system are unique in that they are the only ones that have increased levels of compensation based on earning additional college credit hours and degrees up through a doctorate. These additional levels are a long-standing practice in every school district in the state. For purposes of this study and narrative, we will refer to these higher levels as "lanes", in order to avoid confusion with the use of levels in referring to separate classes. This issue includes the questions of whether the state personnel system should continue using lanes, in light of the impending statewide implementation of the performance pay system, and whether the existing lanes are appropriately spaced.

Three considerations arose on whether or not to keep the lanes. The first consideration is the pay philosophy of the state to compensate employees based on the prevailing market. The study team found that the teacher pay levels are comparable to the prevailing market. The study team reviewed the prevailing practices of other organizations employing teachers. They found that, without exception, all public school districts throughout the state utilize lanes to define their pay grids. While the spacing between the lanes varies significantly between school districts and the ranges of pay vary greatly, they all maintain these lanes and have no plans to eliminate them. Furthermore, from the Department of Corrections' perspective, keeping this practice would probably keep them in compliance with their American Correctional Association (ACA) standard for having "Academic and vocational personnel policies and practices that are comparable to local jurisdictions or other appropriate jurisdictions." While deviating from an ACA standard is not necessarily critical, it should carry some weight in reaching a conclusion on this issue. While the State of Colorado is statutorily required to pay at prevailing levels, specific pay practices are determined by the State Personnel Director in the best interests of the state as an employer.

The second consideration is the number of lanes needed in the state system for teachers. The study group found that the number of lanes range from four to seventeen statewide. The width of the pay range in these lanes also varies greatly, from 6% to 108%. With these wide variances, the department's historical practice for many years has been to pick the most commonly used lanes. Hence, the present grid contains five lanes: Bachelor's (BA), Bachelor's plus 20 hours (BA+20), Master's (MA), Master's plus 20 hours (MA+20), and Doctorate (PhD). A credit hour as used in this narrative equates to a semester hour. An analysis of the lanes used by school districts in the 20 county Front Range area showed that this practice should continue. During the visits to the six representative school districts by the study co-leaders, each district was specifically asked what the basis was for the number and credit-hour designation. None of the districts could offer a rationale, other than "that's the way we've always split them." All school districts use the BA, MA, and PhD.

Upon further review, the study group found that the typical number of semester credit hours required to advance from a Bachelor's to a Master's is 32 to 40 hours. The study group concluded that it seemed consistent to keep the intermediate pay lanes approximately half-way between the degree levels. Therefore, the recommendation of the study group is to retain the present lane designations at the BA+20 and MA+20 credit hours.

With the advent of performance pay for all state employees, an initial reaction of the study team was that the continued use of these lanes and future pay increases based on performance are incompatible. In the past, the higher paying lanes were achieved through gaining additional credit hours and degrees. The study group could not identify any situations where these higher pay lanes were tied to any increased work responsibility or increased productivity by the individual teacher. The most typical response to the question posed was that "It is assumed that the employee becomes a better teacher by getting additional college credits and degrees."

Upon further analysis and discussion, the study group decided that the two might be used in concert with each other. Under the state's performance pay system, individual departments are allowed to develop their own performance measures, in addition to the statewide core competencies. The study group envisioned that departments could, and should, relate increased measures of teaching competencies for teachers at the higher salary lanes. For example, an employee in the MA+20 lane would have a performance standard (measure) at a higher level than another teacher in a lower lane using the same type metric. This would ensure that the state receives increased value from its higher (lane) paid teachers under the performance pay system. This concept supports a basic tenet of performance pay in linking increased pay to levels of performance; however, with the newness of the performance pay system, experience with the above concept may prove or disprove its compatibility.

The final part of this issue was the justification for the fifth or PhD lane. The issue arose as to whether departments needed a PhD level in their academic programs that are mainly oriented towards the GED level, particularly in inmate settings as opposed to preparing students for college. When this subject was presented at the open forums, mixed responses were received. While some felt the lane was unnecessary, the general opinion was that since some academic subjects in an isolated program may justify the PhD, it would be unwise to eliminate the lane when some supervisors could foresee a potential need for it in a youth

corrections treatment setting. Hence, the study team recommends that the PhD lane be retained. When faced with a cost/benefit analysis, departments are encouraged to use the higher performance measures as discussed in the preceding paragraph.

**MOVEMENT TO HIGHER LANES:** This issue was raised by several employees and the study team decided to analyze the present structure. Presently, teacher employees move to the higher lane when they achieve the necessary degree/credits required in the class profile (minimum qualifications). Per the department's statewide policy, this upward movement is accomplished with or without a salary increase as long as their new salary is at or above the minimum for the new grade. This upward movement, based solely on a higher degree, is contrary to other personnel system upward movements where a promotion equates to a class of work requiring higher-level duties, concepts, and factors. This is not the case for the Teacher classes. Movement occurs upon reaching the higher degree or number of additional credit hours. The study group examined this practice in deciding whether to continue or modify it to conform to other classes in the state personnel system.

This issue was discussed with the six school districts. Without exception, they all reported that their teachers were moved to the higher lane when the district validated the required number of credits or advanced degree had been obtained. Other school districts reportedly follow this practice. The movement to the higher lane did not necessarily entail higher-level duties or responsibilities. The effective date of the movement did vary by school district, with most effective the next pay period after the credits or degree were validated by human resources in the district office. The amount of increase varies by school district depending upon the percentage distance to the next higher lane; however, the prevailing practice was to increase their actual pay upon this movement. A few did not become effective until the following year's contract renewal. While not formally documented, school districts reported that they did expect that the added credit hours or degree produce better, more effective teachers. Therefore, although the study group does not recommend a change in this practice of upward movement upon completing the added credits or a degree, the group does recommend that departments include greater expectations in the performance of higher-level teachers as part of their yearly plans and evaluations. Furthermore, the additional credits or a degree should be related to the teaching assignment as stated in the class profiles (minimum qualifications).

A related issue was one agency's concern about the high cost of teachers' salaries compared to other employees in the same work units. Specifically, a few teacher salaries exceed those of some deputy wardens. The compensation staff of the department reviewed the salary levels of the Teacher I classes. Because the annual salary survey includes almost all of the school districts in our prevailing market (Front Range), the salary levels have been maintained very close to the market. Last year's survey continues to reflect that teacher salaries are appropriate to our prevailing market. This issue is an internal equity one that arises when one higher-paid occupation is employed in a facility with many lower-paid employees. The salary levels are appropriate to each type of occupation from the department's perspective as they reflect market differences, and the study group does not recommend any changes.

**SALARY SETTING PROCESS:** The study group received comments on the perceived inequity in the salary levels for the state's year-round teachers versus the typical nine-month school district contracted teachers. Some felt that the conversion ratio was not accurate and did not reflect differences between the

two types of teaching jobs. Historically, the salary survey process uses the monthly Colorado Education Association (CEA) salary reports as the monthly salary for state teachers on a full FTE basis (2080 hours per year). This monthly salary comparison was judged appropriate even though the average school district teacher contract is for 180 days, 15 days short of a normal nine-month average of 195 workdays, by the state's calculation. The rationale behind this "comparability" was that the overwhelming majority of school district teachers take work home on evenings and weekends, while state teachers reportedly do not, and that makes up the difference in the number of days. Further comparisons of benefits showed that these were also comparable. The department judged that the current monthly calculation remains appropriate.

**ADDITIONAL CLASS OR LEVEL:** One agency requested that the study review the need for an additional class between Teacher I and Teacher II. Some employees feel that Teacher Is were being asked to perform duties beyond the concept for the Teacher I class and there should be a higher-level class which recognizes those type of extra duties. These added duties are typically administrative such as a lead role in new teaching programs, budgetary and planning responsibilities, etc. After discussion, the study group decided that this issue was partly caused by that specific agency's decision to not use the Teacher II class in their facilities. The study group felt that some of the duties covered by the existing II class were the ones being placed on Teacher I assignments and that this was a conscious management decision by one agency within their authority on how to make assignments. The study group decided not to create another class when one agency is not using the full spectrum of current classes.

While the study group recognizes agency management's authority to make decisions on job assignments, they believe that agency management should re-evaluate their decision as the study group finds this situation inharmonious with the intended use of the job evaluation system. If that decision stands, then the study group recommends that management use their performance pay program to address the employees' concerns about the added assignments.

**ACADEMIC AND VOCATIONAL EQUIVALENCY:** This issue concerns the equivalency of the academic and vocational levels used for higher pay grades. Presently the class profiles (minimum qualifications) for both types in the Teacher I class are:

<b>Academic Specialty Area</b>	<b>Pay grade</b>	<b>Vocational Specialty Area</b>
I-B Bachelor's	J26	I-H Experience-based credential and/or college credits
I-C Bachelor's plus 20 hours	J28	I-I Experience-based credential plus 20 hours of college
I-D Master's	J31	I-J Experience-based credential plus 40 hours of college
I-E Master's plus 20 hours	J33	I-K Experience-based credential and Bachelor's degree plus 20 hours
I-F Doctorate	J38	I-L Experience-based credential plus Master's degree

Several teachers have raised the issue that the vocational experience and credits/degree should, at some point, be leveled with the degree and credits on the academic side. Some employees believe it is inequitable

to pay a vocational teacher with a Master's degree seven pay grades (17<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>%) more than the academic teacher with a Master's, and that the two should be equivalent at this point.

In response, the co-chair contacted the vocational credentialing agency, Community Colleges of Colorado (CC of C), as reportedly there was a previous study done by Colorado State University in the 1990s that discussed this issue and presented some conclusions as to their findings. However, this study could not be located nor were there any materials related to the studied equivalency. The study group analyzed the basis for granting the vocational credential and found that generally the credential for a technical, trade, or industrial education requires 10,000 hours of work experience. Based on the current credentialing standards manual, July 2000, either a Bachelor's degree or 10,000 hours of occupational work experience suffice for some credentials used by the state's vocational programs.

In conclusion, the study group decided to leave the requirements as they exist as this practice is consistent with CC of C standards. The study group did recommend that the definitions be re-worded to reflect this assumption and the above chart depicts those definitions (e.g., experience-based credential plus).

### **Teacher II class**

After discussing the non-use of this class by one agency, the study group found no changes necessary, other than minor word changes to clarify sentences in the class description. The revised minimum qualifications with current terminology are being proposed concurrently with this study.

### **Teacher III class**

Other than updating the minimum qualifications with the current terminology and some minor word changes in the class description, the study group found no changes necessary.

### **Broadbanding**

Because the department is exploring the viability of broadbanding its pay ranges, the co-chairs briefed the study group on the concept. Broadbanding involves the placement of several levels of pay ranges into one broad standard pay range and individual managers make compensation decisions within that broad band. The two major agencies using the Teacher series were not in favor of broadbanding at this time for several reasons related to administrative needs. One agency reported that they like the present structure as it provides the right balance of limits yet allows sufficient agency discretion within those boundaries. From their perspective, reducing those boundaries would require more management time to administer pay than what is justified. They saw no advantages to broadbanding.

The other agency saw the unstructured broadband as being too easy to manipulate and might create inequities between facilities for similar work. They further reasoned that it would require extensive manager training to enable them to administer the pay of employees in up to 15 different educational programs. Broadbanding of the Teacher classes is not recommended at this time.

## **Childhood Educator classes**

Concurrent with this study, the Health Care Services (HCS) Consolidation study was underway. Part of that group's recommendation was that the Early Childhood Educator class series be moved from HCS to the more appropriate Teacher's occupational group. Input from the user agencies was requested but only two of the nine responded. One no longer uses the class series and the other raised an issue with the low wages for the first level in the series. The Teacher study group reviewed the class concepts and factors and found them to be current and appropriate. Because the Early Childhood Educator series is considered to be unlicensed teaching in a pre-elementary setting, the study group concluded that the Teacher occupational group is the most appropriate and recommends the series be moved to the Teacher group effective 7/1/02.

As with any system maintenance study, salary was reviewed to determine the proper grades. One match for the Childhood Educator I class was found in the most recent February 2001 Mountain States Employers' Council's Parks & Recreation Survey. However, the survey only represents three employers with 12 employees and is insufficient to determine pay grades. The department also found a match in the March 31, 2001, College and University Personnel Association's (CUPA) Mid-Level Administrative/Professional Salary Survey. Because that is national survey data, it was not usable to set salaries in Colorado as no other matched class could be found as a relationship indexer. Staff also investigated other sources of salary information along the Front Range. One source was a child care referral agency, Colorado Office of Resource and Referral Agencies (CORRA), that had participated in research on childcare statistics along the Front Range during 2000. Some salary information was presented, but only on average wages paid. While the information is useful in knowing current average wages being paid, the report does not have structural pay range data needed to set a pay grade.

With insufficient salary information and the concern on low salary levels, the study group recommends that the department conduct a special, direct supplemental survey of the major child care employers along the Front Range in order to make appropriate recommendations before this study is implemented on 7/1/02.

CRS 24-50-104(4)(a) requires the department to meet and confer with management and employee representatives and the Total Compensation Advisory Council (TCAC) on the selection and utilization of surveys before they are conducted. This provision applies to any direct, supplemental surveys that are conducted as part of the system maintenance study. This will be accomplished prior to conducting the supplemental survey on the Early Childhood Educator classes.

## **RESULTS**

The results of this study are the slightly re-worded Teacher Aide and Teacher class descriptions and the movement of the Early Childhood Educator series from HCS to the Teacher Occupational Group. While no significant changes are made to the teacher classes, this study does validate and document the existing basis for setting teacher salaries. A supplemental salary survey of the Early Childhood Educator series will be conducted in FY 01-02.

## **MEET AND CONFER ON PROPOSED RESULTS**

CRS 24-50-104(1)(b) requires the department to meet and confer with affected employees and employee organizations, if requested, regarding the proposed changes before they are implemented as final. This official notice of proposed changes had a deadline of July 10, 2001, by which all "meet and confer" activity must have been concluded. In an effort to proactively facilitate this process, three public meetings were scheduled:

6/27/01	Children's Auditorium, Ft. Logan, Denver	1:30 p.m.
6/29/01	DOC Training Academy, Canon City	10:00 a.m.
7/6/01	Grand Mesa Youth Svs Ctr, 360 28 Road, Grand Junction	11:00 a.m.

### **Results of Meet and Confer on System Changes**

At the scheduled meetings, 12 employees/organizations attended the Ft. Logan session; 34 attended the Canon City session, and eight attended the Grand Mesa session. Additionally, the department received four letters with comments. Many of the suggestions and questions related to the proposed changes to the minimum qualifications, and those are being reported separately by the department under the publication process for minimum qualifications.

The following summarizes the comments and suggestions received:

Several took exception to the statement in the narrative discussion on comparability of salaries between state teachers and school districts that suggested that state teachers do not take work home as often as school district teachers. In response, this was an observation reported by one teacher the study team talked to; and is, perhaps, an overstatement. Regardless of the fact one way or the other, the state's teacher classes' pay ranges are appropriate to the prevailing labor market.

Several attendees from the Department of Corrections remain dissatisfied with the promotional policy within DOC on teachers not receiving any immediate salary increase upon promotion to the higher lane. As explained in the narrative and reiterated during the meeting, the Department of Personnel is not changing its statewide promotional policy as these decisions are delegated to the separate agencies as long as they remain within the broad, statewide policy. Since DOC's promotional policy conforms to the statewide policy, this study can make no changes to an internal, DOC management decision. It was pointed out that this DOC promotional policy differs from other agencies and does not reflect the prevailing market practices. In response, the fact that different departments have differing promotional policies reflects the intent of the Department of Personnel when they established the policy in 1998.

Additionally, the prevailing market's promotional policies are not strictly binding on the state's policies. Per the Department of Personnel's operating guidelines, prevailing trends are *useful information* in determining compensation practices (e.g., hiring, upward, downward, lateral movements, performance and incentive awards) that are matters of employer (state personnel director) judgment and discretion.

Questions arose on the rationale for keeping the academic and vocational levels (lanes) at comparable pay grades given the different credit hours and degrees between the two types. While some agree with keeping them the same and others argue to change them, as explained in this narrative on page seven, the department found insufficient justification to change the existing structure. No changes are made to the lane definitions other than the updated wording.

One comment focused on a lack of information being passed down to employees from their department and supervisor. As explained during the meeting, notifications from the Department of Personnel are sent to the HR Administrators in each agency with a request to forward those to affected supervisors and employees. Decentralized agencies are expected to be accountable for this, but, apparently this is not always being done. The department also places these notices on their web site as an additional aid to communicating possible system changes. Unfortunately, the department does not have an efficient method of communicating directly with each employee affected and must rely on others to distribute the information.

One question was on who uses the Teacher Aide class; the explanation given was that the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind is the primary user as well as some colleges.

Several comments and questions surfaced on how the state's pay for performance system would be implemented. One noted that the few school districts that offer a pay for performance system are additive to their normal pay movements. The state's system will differ because the legislature mandated that the pay for performance replace the anniversary increase system previously used and that it be cost neutral. Hence, the department was unable to implement the pay for performance system as an "add-on". A few employees argued that higher performance expectations not be used as part of the higher lanes that some teachers achieve. In response, the legislative mandate and the prevailing pay practices do not mesh neatly. Some compromise is expected in order to meet the intent of the pay for performance system that applies to all employees and the unique teacher pay grid compared to the rest of the State Personnel System. While not ideal, the department believes that the two can be functional. It is suggested that until agencies gain actual experience with the new performance pay system, it is premature to say that the two are incompatible. It is noted that the pay for performance Executive Oversight Committee did recognize in its August 2000 plan that revisions may be in order once a detailed evaluation of the system operation is available. During the meeting, department representatives urged employees to work with their supervisors and managers to make the performance pay system work to their advantage. Additionally, employees should share performance successes with other facilities and departments to improve the compatibility of pay for performance and the unique teacher pay grid.

CRS 24-50-104(4)(a) also requires that the department "meet and confer in good faith" with management and employee representatives of the state and the Total Compensation Advisory Council (TCAC) in the selection and utilization of direct surveys used to set pay and/or benefit levels. This is relevant as the department intends to conduct a special supplemental salary survey for the Early Childhood Educator classes as explained on page nine of this report. This statutory requirement was addressed concurrently with the meet and confer efforts in the previous paragraphs and TCAC was polled and responded directly to the department via email. Those suggestions and comments will be discussed in the final report on any pay grade adjustments for the Early Childhood Educator classes later this year.

## **FISCAL IMPACT FOR IMPLEMENTATION YEAR**

CRS 24-50-104(4)(c) and (6)(a) require that any study involving increased costs must be included in the Annual Total Compensation Report for an effective date on the ensuing July 1. This study does not propose to adjust any classes upward or downward. If changes to the Early Childhood Educator pay grades are necessary upon completion of the supplemental direct survey, those changes will be published as proposed and additional meet and confer sessions will be scheduled. No changes in pay grades are recommended for this part of the study.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **I. Occupational Group**

No change for the Teacher Aide class or the Teacher series is recommended and these classes remain in the Teacher occupational group. The Early Childhood Educator series is recommended to be moved from the Health Care Services occupational group to the Teacher occupational group on July 1, 2002, and any pay grade changes will be implemented on that date also.

### **II. Class Descriptions**

See attached.

### **III. Class Conversion and/or Placement**

No individual placements are being made in any of the classes. No class conversion is involved.



# **STATE OF COLORADO**

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION**

**September 1, 2001**

### **TEACHERS**

**J1A1\*\* TO J1A3\*\***

#### **Specialty Areas**

A.	Academic (II & III)	G.	Vocational (Teacher II & III)
B.	Teacher I (Academic)	H.	Teacher I (Vocational)
C.	Teacher I (Academic)	I.	Teacher I (Vocational)
D.	Teacher I (Academic)	J.	Teacher I (Vocational)
E.	Teacher I (Academic)	K.	Teacher I (Vocational)
F.	Teacher I (Academic)	L.	Teacher I (Vocational)

### **DESCRIPTION OF OCCUPATIONAL WORK**

This class series uses three levels in the Teacher Occupational Group and describes work in teaching and administration of educational programs, both academic and vocational. By statutes C.R.S. 22-60-102 and 104, a license or credential is required in this class series.

Work in this occupation involves instructing students in subject matter utilizing various teaching methods, such as group instruction, demonstration, and audio-visual aids; preparing course outlines and lesson plans for the classroom and lab or shop; assigning lessons and correcting homework; maintaining order and discipline; testing to evaluate progress and recording results; and, counseling students to assist them with adjustments to instructional and social settings, often so the client or inmate can return to the community. Teachers may also keep related records, e.g., attendance, progress and achievement levels. Most teachers work in security settings where they follow policies and procedures to ensure the safety of themselves and others.

Note: Vocational teaching programs differ from training or apprenticeships in a trade by the instruction of a program that is approved by the community college system and includes a classroom component teaching

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)**

### **TEACHER**

**September 1, 2001**

basic theory to a group of students. The focus is on teaching a marketable skill or trade upon completion of the course of study as opposed to one-on-one, on-the-job training of an employee.

**INDEX:** Teacher I begins on page 2, Teacher II begins on page 3, and Teacher III begins on page 5.

### **TEACHER I**

J1A1\*\*

#### **CONCEPT OF CLASS**

This class describes the fully operational academic or vocational teacher. In this class, positions use a variety of teaching methods and behavioral management techniques to instruct students. Such methods include group instruction on theory, concepts, and terminology, and demonstrations of skills, techniques and methods, and use of lab or shop tools and equipment. Teachers may also maintain student records of grades and attendance, share observations and notes with treatment team members, hold parent conferences, and meet with schools in preparation for transition after discharge. Also included in this class are positions performing work as an education diagnostician. Diagnostic work includes administering and scoring standardized academic and vocational tests to assess the current functioning level and need for special education, collecting background information, and interpreting and communicating findings in order to establish educational goals. Such testing is focused on educational needs and does not include interpretation of psychological tests that would be done by a psychologist. This level also includes positions receiving orientation to the agency setting within the initial probationary period.

Note: The actual pay grade of an individual teacher in this class varies based partially on educational achievement. (Refer to the current compensation plan.)

#### **FACTORS**

**Allocation must be based on meeting all of the four factors as described below.**

**Decision Making** -- The decisions regularly made are at the operational level, as described here. Within limits set by the specific process, choices involve deciding what operation is required to carry out the process. This includes determining how the operation will be completed. For example, within content area curricula guides and educational program policies and objectives, the teacher determines how to implement the educational process for a given student by writing lesson plans, selecting instructional materials and methods, and selecting the individual behavioral management techniques to apply. By nature, data needed to make decisions are numerous and variable so reasoning is needed to develop the practical course of action within the established process. For example, the teacher must consider educational techniques and the students' capabilities in order to design an instructional plan to implement the educational process on a practical level. Choices are within a range of specified, acceptable standards, alternatives, and technical practices. For example, within allotted space and classroom funds, positions in this class choose and requisition materials that will provide the best instruction of students.

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)**

### **TEACHER**

**September 1, 2001**

**Complexity** -- The nature of, and need for, analysis and judgment is patterned, as described here. Positions study educational information and student capabilities to determine what they mean and how they fit together in order to get practical solutions in the form of lesson plans and approaches to individual behavioral management and motivation. Guidelines in the form of educational theory and techniques, educational program policy and procedures, agency rules and regulations, and legal requirements and standards exist for most situations. Judgment is needed in locating and selecting the most appropriate of these guidelines that may change for varying circumstances as the task is repeated. For example, teachers must select the most appropriate technique from behavior management guidelines and adapt instructional strategies and program curricula to the needs and skills of the student. This selection and interpretation of guidelines involves choosing from alternatives where all are correct but one is better than another depending on the given circumstances of the situation. For example, the diagnostician chooses from a battery of tests when assessing the individual student's educational level, which may vary from case to case given the circumstances of the specific individual.

**Purpose of Contact** -- Regular work contacts with others outside the supervisory chain, regardless of the method of communication, are for the purpose of clarifying underlying rationale, intent, and motive by educating others on unfamiliar concepts and theories or marketing a product or service. This goes beyond what has been learned in training or repeating information that is available in another format. The primary purpose of this occupation is to educate students in the theories, concepts, and skills and practices of an academic or vocational subject. Teachers also clarify the findings of educational tests by interpreting results for others who do not have an educational background.

**Line/Staff Authority** -- The direct field of influence the work of a position has on the organization is as an individual contributor. The individual contributor may explain work processes and train others. The individual contributor may serve as a resource or guide by advising others on how to use processes within a system or as a member of a collaborative problem-solving team. This level may include positions performing supervisory elements that do not fully meet the criteria for the next level in this factor.

### **TEACHER II**

J1A2\*\*

### **CONCEPT OF CLASS**

This class describes the first-level supervisor. In addition to teaching, positions supervise at least three full-time equivalent positions and are responsible for planning and monitoring an educational program component or unit in an agency. Work includes implementing policy and procedure to comply with guidelines, evaluating the program component to assess areas for change and recommend curricula guidelines, preparing the annual budget request for the program component or unit and monitoring allocated funds, and evaluating and monitoring the effectiveness of staff and organizing staff training. The Teacher II differs from the Teacher I on Decision Making, Complexity and Line/Staff Authority.

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)**

### **TEACHER**

**September 1, 2001**

### **FACTORS**

**Allocation must be based on meeting all of the four factors as described below.**

**Decision Making** -- The decisions regularly made are at the process level, as described here. Within limits set by professional standards, the agency's available technology and resources, and program objectives and regulations established by a higher management level, choices involve determining the process, including designing the set of operations. The general pattern, program, or system exists but must be individualized. For example, within an agency's general educational program, positions in this class determine the processes for the specific program component or unit. This individualization requires analysis of data that is complicated. Analysis is breaking the problem or case into parts, examining these parts, and reaching conclusions that result in processes. This examination requires the application of known and established theory, principles, conceptual models, professional standards, and precedents in order to determine their relationship to the problem. For example, positions in this class use assigned staff and funds to operate the program component or unit and to recommend program changes. New processes or objectives require approval of higher management or the agency with authority and accountability for the program or system.

**Complexity** -- The nature of, and need for, analysis and judgment is formulative, as described here. Positions evaluate the relevance and importance of educational theories, concepts, and principles in order to tailor them to develop a different approach or tactical plan to fit specific circumstances. While general policy, precedent, or non-specific practices exist; they are inadequate so they are relevant only through approximation or analogy. For example, positions in this class adapt policy, curricula guidelines, and educational standards and strategies to fit the needs of the specific program component or unit. In conjunction with theories, concepts, and principles, positions use judgment and resourcefulness in tailoring the existing guidelines so they can be applied to particular circumstances and to deal with emergencies. For example, positions use resourcefulness in using existing resources to keep the program component or unit functioning and to comply with the agency's educational program policies and objectives.

**Purpose of Contact** -- Regular work contacts with others outside the supervisory chain, regardless of the method of communication, are for the purpose of clarifying underlying rationale, intent, and motive by educating others on unfamiliar concepts and theories or marketing a product or service. This goes beyond what has been learned in training or repeating information that is available in another format. The primary purpose of this occupation is to educate students in the theories, concepts, and skills and practices of an academic or vocational subject. In addition to teaching, positions in this class clarify to other teachers the intent of processes and procedures for the specific program component or unit.

**Line/Staff Authority** -- The direct field of influence the work of a position has on the organization is as a unit supervisor. The unit supervisor is accountable, including signature authority, for actions and decisions that directly impact the pay, status, and tenure of three or more full-time equivalent positions. At least one of the subordinate positions must be in the same series or at a comparable conceptual level. The elements

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)**

### **TEACHER**

**September 1, 2001**

of formal supervision must include providing documentation to support recommended corrective and disciplinary actions, signing performance plans and appraisals, and resolving informal grievances. Positions start the hiring process, interview applicants, and recommend hire, promotion, or transfer.

### **TEACHER III**

J1A3\*\*

### **CONCEPT OF CLASS**

This class describes the position functioning as the director of an educational program or school for an agency. Positions in this class prepare and monitor the budget for an agency's program or school, including allotting instructional funds to each academic and vocational teacher; establish the organizational structure for the agency's program or school; and, plan and monitor the educational program. Programmatic responsibilities include assessing program needs, developing program or school curricula, evaluating the program and making adjustments, and formulating the standards and procedures to comply with certification requirements established by other state agencies. The Teacher III differs from the Teacher II on Decision Making, Complexity and Purpose of Contact.

### **FACTORS**

**Allocation must be based on meeting all of the four factors as described below.**

**Decision Making** -- The decisions regularly made are at the interpretive level, as described here. Within limits of the strategic master plan and allocated human and fiscal resources, choices involve determining tactical plans to achieve the objectives established by the higher management (strategic) level. This involves establishing what processes will be done, developing the budget, and developing the staffing patterns and work units in order to deploy staff. For example, positions in this class establish the annual budget request and approve expenditures for the program or school, develop the operating plan, and establish processes for compliance with state certification requirements. By nature, this is the first level where positions are not bound by processes and operations in their own programs as a framework for decision making and there are novel or unique situations that cause uncertainties that must be addressed at this level. Through deliberate analysis and experience with these unique situations, the manager determines the systems, guidelines, and programs for the future. For example, based on program evaluation and assessment, positions in this class adjust program standards and curricula.

**Complexity** -- The nature of, and need for, analysis and judgment is strategic, as described here. Positions develop guidelines to implement a program that maintains the agency's mission. Guidelines do not exist for most situations. For example, positions in this class write policy and procedure, and develop educational guidelines to implement the educational program in an agency whose primary mission is not education. In directive situations, positions use judgment and resourcefulness to interpret circumstances in a variety of situations and establish guidelines that direct how a departmental/agency program will be implemented. For example, in establishing guidelines to implement an agency's educational program, positions in this class must

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)**

### **TEACHER**

**September 1, 2001**

consider educational theory and strategy along with behavioral and treatment techniques for students with mental, physical, or criminal behavior considerations.

**Purpose of Contact** -- Regular work contacts with others outside the supervisory chain, regardless of the method of communication, are for the purpose of negotiating as an official representative of one party in order to obtain support or cooperation where there is no formal rule or law to fall back on in requiring such action or change from the other party. Such negotiation has fiscal or programmatic impact on an agency. In reaching settlements or compromises, the position does not have a rule or regulation to enforce but is accountable for the function. For example, positions in this class negotiate with the Colorado Department of Education on compliance requirements for certification and with school districts on special education services as students transition. Such negotiations impact the educational program in an agency, including fiscal resources.

**Line/Staff Authority** -- The direct field of influence the work of a position has on the organization is as a unit supervisor. The unit supervisor is accountable, including signature authority, for actions and decisions that directly impact the pay, status, and tenure of three or more full-time equivalent positions. At least one of the subordinate positions must be in the same series or at a comparable conceptual level. The elements of formal supervision must include providing documentation to support recommended corrective and disciplinary actions, signing performance plans and appraisals, and resolving informal grievances. Positions start the hiring process, interview applicants, and recommend hire, promotion, or transfer.

### **DEFINITIONS**

Academic: certified instruction of theoretical and social/life subject matter.

Vocational: certified instruction of basic theory and the development of manipulative skills in a specific trade.

\*B - \*F and \*H - \*L: codes for salary purposes in the Teacher I class; \*A and \*G codes for salary purposes in the Teacher II and III classes. Refer to the compensation plan.

### **ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS**

Minimum entry requirements and general knowledge, skills, and abilities for classes in this series are contained in the class job profile.

For purposes of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the essential functions of specific positions are identified in the position description questionnaires and job analyses.

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)**

### **TEACHER**

**September 1, 2001**

## **CLASS SERIES HISTORY**

Effective 9/1/01 (DLF). Teacher consolidation study - revised class descriptions and minimum qualifications. Published as proposed 6/19/01.

Effective 9/1/93 (KKF). Job Evaluation System Revision project. Converted Academic Teacher (B0261-5) to Teacher I (J1A1\*B-F). Converted Academic Teacher (B0266) to Teacher II (J1A2\*A). Converted Academic Teacher (B0267, 9) to Teacher III (J1A3\*A). Converted Vocational Teacher (B0271-5) to Teacher I (J1A1\*H-L). Converted Vocational Teacher (B0276) to Teacher II (J1A2\*G). Converted Vocational Teacher (B0277) to Teacher III (J1A3\*G). Published as proposed 4/9/93.

Revised 7/1/90 (SH). Changed pay grades for Academic and Vocational Teacher I and II.

Created 7/1/78. Academic Teachers (B0261-B0267), Educational Supervisor (B0269), Vocational Teachers (B0271-B0277).

## **SUMMARY OF FACTOR RATINGS**

<b>Class Level</b>	<b>Decision Making</b>	<b>Complexity</b>	<b>Purpose of Contact</b>	<b>Line/Staff Authority</b>
Teacher I	Operational	Patterned	Clarify	Indiv. Contributor
Teacher II	Process	Formulative	Clarify	Unit Supervisor
Teacher III	Interpretive	Strategic	Negotiate	Unit Supervisor

ISSUING AUTHORITY: Colorado Department of Personnel/General Support Services



## **STATE OF COLORADO**

### **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION**

**September 1, 2001**

#### **TEACHER AIDE**

J2A1XX

#### **DESCRIPTION OF OCCUPATIONAL WORK**

This class series uses one level in the Teacher Occupational Group and describes work in instructing portions of a class and tutoring individual students to assist the classroom teacher with the education of students. Work involves following a teacher's specific directions in order to implement lesson plans and coordinate instructional efforts; maintaining order and discipline in the classroom and on school grounds; planning and preparing teaching aids; presenting the subject matter to students through group instruction, discussion, role playing, or demonstration; and monitoring behavior and assisting students with assignments in order to present or reinforce subject matter concepts and meet instructional or behavioral needs. Positions in this class may also perform support tasks, including taking attendance, using answer keys to grade homework or exams and record grades, typing or entering data and reproducing instructional materials, and maintaining the supply inventory and preparing requisitions for purchases. Positions may work in a security facility or a special education setting with students with disabilities. It is the assistance to the credentialed classroom teacher with the instruction of students that separates this class series from other occupations working in an educational setting.

#### **CONCEPT OF CLASS**

This class describes the teacher aide. As described above, positions in this class assist a teacher by implementing lesson plans as directed, instructing students, monitoring and responding to a student's instructional and behavioral needs, and conferring with the teacher on special needs of the student. Positions in this class also perform office support tasks, such as maintaining and mailing student records, copying materials, maintaining the supply inventory and filling requests. In this class, positions may monitor the classroom when the teacher is away for brief periods of time. Included in this class are positions receiving training and orientation where performance is expected to reach the fully operational level within the initial probationary period.

## **CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)**

### **TEACHER AIDE**

**September 1, 2001**

### **FACTORS**

**Allocation must be based on meeting all of the four factors as described below.**

**Decision Making** -- The decisions regularly made are at the defined level, as described here. Within limits prescribed by the operation, choices involve selecting alternatives that affect the manner and speed with which tasks are carried out. For example, positions in this class carry out lesson plans and directions prescribed by a teacher. These choices do not affect the standards or results of the operation itself because there is typically only one correct way to carry out the operation. These alternatives include independent choice of such things as priority and personal preference for organizing and processing the work, proper tools or equipment, speed, and appropriate steps in the operation to apply. For example, teacher aides prioritize assignments and the appropriate steps to maintain discipline as prescribed. By nature, the data needed to make decisions can be numerous but are clear and understandable so logic is needed to apply the prescribed alternative. Positions can be taught what to do to carry out assignments and any deviation in the manner in which the work is performed does not change the end result of the operation. For example, any deviation from prescribed lesson plans and instructions requires conferring with the teacher first or following pre-established alternatives.

**Complexity** -- The nature of, and need for, analysis and judgment is prescribed, as described here. Positions apply established, standard guidelines that cover work situations and alternatives. For example, positions in this class apply specific rules, directions, and lesson plans in instructing students or apply established purchasing procedures when requesting or purchasing supplies. Action taken is based on learned, specific guidelines that permit little deviation or change as the task is repeated. Any alternatives to choose from are clearly right or wrong at each step. For example, an error results if automated system instructions and procedures are not followed when entering data.

**Purpose of Contact** -- Regular work contacts with others outside the supervisory chain, regardless of the method of communication, are for the purpose of advising, counseling, or guiding the direction taken to resolve complaints or problems and influence or correct actions and behaviors. For example, in instructing students, positions in this class guide student behavior to maintain discipline, and coach and respond to instructional needs.

**Line/Staff Authority** -- The direct field of influence the work of a position has on the organization is as an individual contributor. The individual contributor may explain work processes and train others. The individual contributor may serve as a resource or guide by advising others on how to use processes within a system or as a member of a collaborative problem-solving team.

### **ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS**

Minimum entry requirements and general knowledge, skills, and abilities for classes in this series are

**CLASS SERIES DESCRIPTION (Cont'd.)****TEACHER AIDE****September 1, 2001**

contained in the class job profile. For purposes of the Americans with Disabilities Act, the essential functions of specific positions are identified in the position description questionnaires and job analyses.

**CLASS SERIES HISTORY**

Effective 9/1/01 (DLF). Teacher Consolidation Study - revised class description. Published as proposed 6/19/01.

Created 9/1/93 (KKF). Job Evaluation System Revision project. Published as proposed 4/9/93.

**SUMMARY OF FACTOR RATINGS**

<b>Class Level</b>	<b>Decision Making</b>	<b>Complexity</b>	<b>Purpose of Contact</b>	<b>Line/Staff Authority</b>
Teacher Aide	Defined	Prescribed	Advise	Indiv. Contributor

ISSUING AUTHORITY: Colorado Department of Personnel/General Support Services